

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 40-44 are allowed and that claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 28 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 45 has been amended to overcome the objection.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20-25 and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,827 (Geist) in view of Schmeidler and further in view of Bisbee et al. In the “response to arguments” section of the office action it is alleged that the applicants response addressed the references individually and as such can not allegedly show non-obviousness. However, applicants respectfully submit that where a reference is cited for a particular teaching and where that reference does not teach what is alleged, the claims can not be found obvious. As to claims 1, 17, 20, and 29, specific claim language has not been addressed and as such the rejection is not a prima facie rejection. Accordingly the claims should be passed to allowance because the references do not teach the claimed subject matter and the rejection does not identify which reference teaches or suggests the claimed subject matter. If the rejection is maintained, a non-final action must be issued.

For example, among other things, claim 1 requires generating a digital signature verification map containing a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers. Geist has been cited as allegedly teaching the claimed digital signature verification map, but the rejection omits actual claim language. Applicants are unable to find which reference allegedly teaches or suggests “a digital signature or verification map containing a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers” that are for example associated with a public key certificate identifier.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is improper to omit claim language in an effort to render a claim unpatentable.

Geist is directed to a method and data file structure for embedding a digital signature verification key within a particular type of image data file to enable validation of the image data autonomously such as without consulting large external databases of public keys or certificates. Geist teaches a different system and method from that claimed by Applicant. For example, the Geist reference is directed to securing an image data file that identifies predetermined subsets of data residing in the data file and stores non-image data in preselected locations in the data file with the image data. (See cited section of column 2, lines 44-62).

Claims 1, 17, 20 and 29, for example, require determining a digital signature verification error based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. The office action appears to parse the language of this step in claim 1 (and other claims) and the other step of claim 1 to disregard specific claim language. For example, as claimed, the determination of the digital signature verification error is based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. In addition, a digital signature verification map as claimed is generated that contains a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers associated with the public key certificate identifier. As such, Applicant claims the determination of a digital signature verification error based on specified information and a generation of a digital signature verification map containing specified information, none of which is taught or suggested in the cited references. For example, the office action merely cites Geist as teaching a digital signature verification error determination by citing the Abstract, FIGs. 2 and 3, and column 2, lines 44-62 without taking into account the other claim language. In any event, Applicant respectfully submits that no digital signature verification error determination is

described in the cited portions of Geist. Instead, the cited portions define a data structure used and taught by Geist to provide self authentication of a data structure such as an image. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing as to where the claimed subject matter is allegedly taught in the cited references.

In addition, the office action cites Geist as allegedly teaching the generation of the claimed digital signature verification map. However, the cited portion of Geist, namely column 4, lines 45-67; column 5 – column 6, line 38, and FIGs. 1-3, after being reviewed do not appear to teach any such digital signature verification map as claimed. Instead for example, the cited portion of column 4 refers to directory entries and custom tags that are used for specifying an authentication index. In particular, such four private custom directory entries specify custom tags or pointers in the data structure. It also teaches excluding authenticatable data from an authentication index. Applicant is unable to find any generation of a digital signature verification map as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing by column and line number of where the cited reference teaches the subject matter as alleged.

In addition, since the reference does not teach what is alleged the combination with the other references also does not teach the claimed subject matter and as such, the claim is in condition for allowance for at least this reason as well.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geist in view of Schmeidler and Bisbee and further in view of Cooper for the reasons applied to claims 1,

10, 20 and 29. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 46, the office action alleges that Geist teaches continually updating the digital signature verification map, that contains a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers, to accommodate aliases to a common subject associated with a certificate, citing column 5-6 line 38. However as noted above Geist is not directed to a system that performs such an operation, but to the contrary, the cited portion refers to verifying a digital image signature as stored in an image TIFF file. Applicants are unable to find any mention of updating a digital signature verification map to accommodate aliases since Geist is not directed to such a system. In addition applicants are unable to find any mention of aliases or any reason to deal with such an issue in Geist. If the rejection is maintained applicants respectfully request a showing by line number as to where the claimed subject matter is allegedly taught in Geist as applicants are unable to find such a teaching.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2006

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P. C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005